

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,102	02/04/2004	Paul V. Cooper	23438.00001	3968
75	90 06/27/2006	EXAMINER		
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. Two Renaissance Square Suite 2700 40 North Central Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85004-4498			KASTLER, SCOTT R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	
			DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		(-)				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/773,102	COOPER, PAUL V.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Scott Kastler	1742				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuly Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind It will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed I the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 I	<u>May 2006</u> .					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Thi	is action is non-final.					
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims		·				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 33 is/are withdrawn 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-22,24-32 and 34 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 23 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>11 August 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/24/2005.</li> </ol>	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D  5) Notice of Informal I  6) Other:					

#### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I (claims 1-32 and 34) in the reply filed on 5/3/2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim 33 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 5/3/2006.

## Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner acknowledges receipt of the lengthy information disclosure statement filed 6/24/2005. There is no requirement that applicants explain the materiality of English language references, however the cloaking of a clearly relevant reference in a long list of references may not comply with applicants' duty to disclose, see Penn Yan Boats, Inc. v. Sea Lark Boats, Inc., 359 F. Supp. 948, aff'd 479 F. 2d. 1338. There is no duty for the Examiner to consider these references to a greater extent than those ordinarily looked at during a regular search by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Examiner has considered these references in the same manner as references encountered during a normal search of Office search files.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/773,102

Art Unit: 1742

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The above claim is indefinite because the term "the gas release device" contains no antecedent basis.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Russian'401. Russian'401 teaches a device including an inlet structure (2) with a plurality of holes (6) though which molten metal can pass, and a displacement structure comprising rotor blades (4) attached to the inlet structure, where in use, the inlet structure and displacement structure rotate together, thereby showing all aspects of the above claims since the manner or method of use of the claimed device (in a molten metal pump) cannot be relied upon to fairly further limit claims to the device itself. see MPEP 2114.

Claims 1, 4-11 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Duenkelmann'060. Duenkelmann'060 teaches a structure which acts as a molten metal pump (see col. 2 lines 49-51), including an inlet structure of a plurality of holes or openings and rotor blades acting as displacement structures connected thereto each made of graphite or other

Application/Control Number: 10/773,102

Art Unit: 1742

refractory ceramics (see col. 1 line 63 to col. 2 line 16 for example) where there can be 3 inlets and rotor blades, and where the device includes a threaded connective portion (4) thereby showing all aspects of the above claims.

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Scheffler'133. Scheffler'133 teaches a molten metal pump including an inlet structure made of refractory ceramic (16) and attached displacement structures comprising rotor blades (41) which rotate along with the inlet structure, thereby showing all aspects of the above claims.

Claims 1-4, 7, 12-14, 16-18, 22, 24, 25, 26 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rawson et al'383. Rawson et al'383 teaches a molten metal pump (in the figure) including a motor (11), a pump base with a pump chamber (29) and discharge (30) in the form of a tangential molten metal conduit connected to the chamber (29) without cement, and a device including an inlet (20) with an opening, and a connected displacement structure (22, 24, 24A) including a rotor blade, where the inlet structure is made of ceramic, and including a bearing surface (13) comprising one or more grooves, and a drive shaft (12) connecting the motor (11) to the device (20) allowing the inlet structure (20) and displacement device (22,24) to rotate together, thereby showing all aspects of the above claims.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15, 19-21 and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rawson et al'383 in view or Dunkelmann'060. as applied to claim 1 above, Rawson et al'383 shows all aspects of the above claims except the use of graphite as the inlet and rotor material, the inclusion of a gas introduction means to the device, or the use of a threaded connection for connection of the drive shaft (12) to the motor (11). Dunkelmann'060 teaches that in order to more effectively disperse gas in a molten metal, inclusion of a gas introduction device (8) within the pump was known in the art at the time the invention was made, as was the use of the instantly claimed graphite components and connection means. Because Rawson et al'383 would also desire improved gas delivery, where gas delivery is desired, as well as requiring some type of inlet and rotor material and drive shaft-motor connection, motivation to employ the gas delivery means taught by Dunkelmann'060 as well as the materials and connection means recited as typical for molten metal pumps, in the molten metal pump taught by Rawson et al'383, would have been a modification obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1742

# Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 23 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Kastler whose telephone number is (571) 272-1243. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/773,102 Page 7

Art Unit: 1742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or \$71-272-1000.

Scott Kastler Primary Examiner Art Unit 1742

sk